

panels.

Applicant's claim 1, as amended, provides "a flexible sheet panel... extending straight through a slot in one of said upper frame member and said lower frame member to an outer edge of said one of said upper frame member and said lower frame member...". Such construction is not evident in Fridolph, as the fabric panel thereof only extends into a closed section of molding, and not "straight through... to an outer edge" of the frame member. Applicant's amended claim 1 further specifies "a sheet panel support disposed along an outer edge of one of said upper frame member and said lower frame member...". This feature is also not found in Fridolph, which particularly describes a sheet panel support mounted along inner edges of the upper and lower frame members. Applicant's amended claim 1 further specifies "a sheet panel support disposed along an outer edge of one of said upper frame member and said lower frame member and a sheet panel support and tensioner disposed in an opposite one of said upper frame member and said lower frame member" As such, at one end of Applicant's door is a support, and at the other is a support and tensioner, requiring different construction at each end. In contrast, the panel ends of Fridolph are of like construction.

For reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the reference to Fridolph is no longer a proper reference under 35 USC 102 with respect to claim 1 due to differences in construction, function and result.

With respect to claim 4, it is particularly noted that Applicant's panel is formed at upper and lower ends into loops through which a dowel pin is inserted to securely hold the panel tautly at each end across its entire width. In contrast, the fabric panels of Fridolph are held only intermittantly (Col. 3 lines 61 - 63) by metal clips, which can allow vertical sagging at the unsupported locations. Claim 12 describes a recess surface against which the panel rests so as to be coplanar with the opposing slot, with notches in lower sides thereof for receiving a dowel pin. No such construction is evident in Fridolph. Newly added claims 13 - 15 describe Applicant's panel extending into edges of the side frame members, and being unsupported in narrow grooves therein that are coplanar with the upper groove and recess surface. This provides a cleaner look than the apparently loose side edges of the panel of Fridolph.

In addition to the above reasons obviating the rejection to claims 2, 4, 10 and 11, claims 2, 4, and 10 - 15, being dependent on a base claim believed allowable, should also be found allowable upon claim 1 being found allowable.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 4 - 7 are rejected over Fridolph in view of Loomis, the reference to Loomis teaching the use of metal rods used in conjunction with adjustable metal brackets for mounting a billboard sign. Here, the brackets mount a

flexible billboard in front of a solid "support structure".

Applicant's claim 4, as amended, provides a composite cabinet door including all the limitations of claims 1, 2 and 4. Here, one end of Applicant's "dowel pins" is specified to be mounted in a groove in an outer edge of one of the frame members, the groove communicating with a slot extending through the frame member. The fabric sheet panel passes through the frame member via the slot. A dowel pin extending through the tubular loop rests in the groove communicating with the slot, thus supporting the panel in place without being visible from either side of the door in accordance with its intended use as a decorative, changable panel for a cabinet door. No such structure, function or result is taught by the combination of Fridolph and Loomis, nor is it seen how the mounting brackets of Loomis may be used in combination with the decorative purposes of Fridolph. As such, there is no motivation to combine Loomis with Fridolph as suggested by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments to the claims have obviated the rejection to claim 4.

In addition to the foregoing, claim 4, dependent on a base claim believed allowable, should also be found allowable upon claim 1 being found allowable.

As claims 5 - 7 are cancelled with this amendment, their rejection is moot.

As the objections and rejections to the claims are believed to be obviated by this amendment, favorable action is respectfully requested. No new matter is added by this amendment. If there are any issues remaining that may be resolved by telephone, a call from the Examiner is solicited. A 1 month extension of time is requested, and a check in the amount of \$60.00 is submitted herewith to cover the extension. It is also noted that the Attorney of Record, Joseph Beumer, has passed away recently, and Mark Clodfelter is acting as an agent under 37 CFR 1.34 until a power of attorney can be obtained from Mr. Payne.

By: 

Mark Clodfelter, Agent under 37 CFR 1.34
Registration number: 34,564
Customer number: 20115
555 Sparkman Drive
Suite 1602D
Huntsville, Ala. 35816
Tel. (256) 895-8339